

the materials of the cited references are not “liquid” silicone systems, they are high consistency silicone rubber systems and are markedly different from the liquid silicone systems of the instant invention.

As proof, the Examiner is directed to the reference ‘290, and the examples therein. The patentee discloses in example 1, a degree of polymerization (dp) of 3000. This dp is for the base siloxane, not for the final formulated product. Further proof is that the final formulated product was made by a kneader-mixer that is typically used for high consistency rubber formulating (See example 1).

In addition, the product of example 1 of the ‘290 patent had to be cured between hot plates at 170°C for 10 minutes, and then heat treated in an air convection oven for 4 hours at 200°C to obtain a final cure. This certainly is not a “fast cure”. This information should be compared to the examples in the instant specification wherein the liquid silicone rubber systems of the invention were cured in seconds, i.e., a “fast cure”.

Thus, the ‘290 patent does not teach nor anticipate the instant invention and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 to 8 and 10 to 13 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hatanaka et al, U.S. Patent 4,329,275.

This reference deals with liquid silicone rubber systems, but the systems are platinum cured. The formulations contain a significant ingredient that is not found in the claims of the instant invention, platinum. In addition, the platinum requires phosphorous to effect the type of cure desired in the ‘275 patent. Thus, the ‘275 patent does not teach nor anticipate the instant invention and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 to 8 and 10 to 12 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Reitmeier et al, U.S. Patent 6,790,533.

Reitmeier et al deal with a silicone rubber system that is high consistency. The system is platinum cured when an –SiH curing system is used. If the system is cured with peroxides, then there is not any –SiH in the system. (See the examples). Thus, Reitmeier et al is an either/or system, either it is platinum cured, or is peroxide cured. Thus, this reference does not teach the instant invention and the instant invention is not anticipated by Reitmeier.

Claims 1 to 8 and 11 to 13 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Azechi et al, U.S. Patent 6,734,250.

It should be noted by the Examiner that the '250 patent does not teach or anticipate the instant invention as it is also an either/or system (See Columns 11 and 12, especially column 11, lines 10 to 15 wherein component D requires not only -SiH groups, but also at least one other reactive group, because this material is an adhesion additive). (See also, column 19, lines 47 to 50) Even if one skilled in the art could perceive this component D as an "-SiH fluid", one would not use this material in the composition of the instant invention because of the fact that it would cause adhesion of the materials. Since the materials of the instant invention are usually molded, or extruded, one would not want to have any adhesion additive added to the formulation and thus, one would not be led to, or taught by, the '250 reference, that fast cures can be obtained on liquid silicone systems by non-adhesive -SiH materials (See column 24, lines 3 and 4, and other examples).

Further, since the objective of the instant invention is to provide fast curing liquid silicone rubbers, why would one perceive that the compositions of the '250 patent could provide such a material? That reference does not make one comment regarding fast cure, in fact, all of the examples require high heat and extended times for cure. Based on the above, it is the applicant's position that this reference does not teach nor anticipate the instant invention and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. McKellar
Reg. No. 26,002
(989) 631-4551